

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

VOL. XII, No. 7

APRIL 28, 1952

\$2.00 per year, 10 cents per copy

PUBLIC LIBRARY

DETROIT

Decisions for Christian Student Movements

NO QUESTION in recent decades has so exercised the professional leadership of Protestant student movements in America as the proposal that the United Student Christian Council should become a department of the National Council of Churches. The USCC, organized in 1943 and consisting at present of fifteen student movements (eleven of which are oriented toward denominations), has been in negotiation over the proposal since 1948 and has approved it in principle. The constituent movements of the USCC are now studying the question, and it is expected that a final decision will be made in September.

The importance of the proposed affiliation arises from several facts. Thus far the voice of Christian youth has hardly been heard in the National Council of Churches, and there is some apprehension that the National Council may be directed largely by a gerontocracy if not by a plutocracy. In any event, the National Council of Churches can hardly expect to retain the interest and loyalty of young people who have almost no relation to it. Nor can it claim to be truly representative of Protestantism under such circumstances, or to be working effectively in one of the more important areas for the future of the church.

From the standpoint of the USCC, it is anticipated that incorporation into the National Council would relate the student movements more closely to the churches, would stimulate a more unified plan and provide added resources for an approach to college students, and would perhaps add evangelical fervor to that approach. Certainly the magnitude of the task confronting student Christian movements on contemporary campuses requires a unified and well-implemented plan, and the opportunity for impressive results has seldom been greater than at the present time.

Nearly all the denominational student movements appear to favor the incorporation of the USCC into

the National Council. The Student YMCA and YWCA are considerably more cautious, and they have raised a number of questions about the proposal. Would a unified and inclusive approach to students be assured under the aegis of a National Council controlled by denominations? Would the lay character of the campus situation be subject to clerical domination? Would the autonomy and freedom of the youth movements be guaranteed within a structure as hierarchial as is the National Council, with respect to determination of policy, choice of staff, control of budgets, and the like? Would doctrinal or creedal tests be imposed on students seeking membership in campus religious organizations, or on representatives of student groups who are nominated to serve on committees or departments of the National Council? Would an undenominational type of ecumenical (and sometimes interfaith) organization be stopped on the college campus? Would the prophetic concern of students for racial equality, political and academic freedom, economic justice, and the like be muted or discouraged?

Efforts have been made, almost over-elaborately, to safeguard the independence of the various student movements in the USCC if their larger body should become a department of the National Council. A great many astute observers still fear that the organizational machinery and the location of real authority in the National Council would tend to dominate the student department, whatever a set of by-laws might declare. On the other hand, there is almost unanimous agreement that the USCC should become a department of the National Council if adequate safeguards can be assured.

The complexity and confusion surrounding the present debate are indicative of problems more fundamental than that of the relation of the USCC to the National Council. The plain fact is that the various Christian student movements have not yet learned to work effectively with each other on the

campuses across the nation, with a few notable exceptions. Large state universities afford a context of such magnitude and diversity that the respective student organizations are able to work alongside each other without great friction, but the undefined character of their relationships creates real tension in many smaller colleges.

This central question of day-to-day relationships on the campuses cannot be settled satisfactorily by an organic merger, or lack of it, at the top. The denominational approach to students and the non-denominational approach of the YMCA and YWCA cannot be reconciled, in sponsorship or in philosophy or in respective emphases. Under the auspices of the National Council of Churches, a genuinely interdenominational approach might be evolved, if the leaders of the respective student movements are willing to make the sacrifices involved. Probably students themselves will be unwilling to settle for less.

Another issue of deeper import has to do with the actual and potential relationship of the various Christian student movements to the institutions of higher education. Tax-supported universities have often been skeptical of the denominational approaches to their students, and this feeling has been widely shared even in private colleges that began under denominational auspices. Most institutions appear to be more receptive at the present time to religious interests and programs than has been the case in recent decades; the new opportunities afforded thereby to the student Christian movements may easily be lost by over-zealous invasions of the campus under clerical or ecclesiastical auspices. The college or university is not itself a church, and college administrators do not necessarily believe that their institutions should be fragmented by the diverse bodies in American Protestantism.

In short, a grand strategy for religious work on the campus is desperately needed, and this question is more fundamental than the relationship of the USCC to the National Council of Churches. Probably it would be better to view the latter question in the light of the fundamental problem, rather than primarily in terms of organizational relationships. A simplified and unified organization for student religious work is imperative: hardened professionals in this field have been known to blanch before the almost incredible confusion of existing relationships and the alphabetical lingo employed to describe them. But the basic problem has to do with function and strategy rather than with organization.—L.P.

Editorial Notes

WE HOPE that Protestants as well as Catholics will read Thomas Sugrue's *A Catholic Speaks His Mind*.^{*} It will be important for Protestants partly that they may understand with what devotion a Catholic may espouse the principles of democracy and how vitally he relates them to the Christian spirit of love, to the modesty which all men should have before forms of life and devotion, other than their own. But it is also important because it is a genuine and non-partisan judgment upon the spiritual, social and political pride in which both Catholics and Protestants are involved in their political contests with one another.

Sugrue quotes the late Simone Weil, a Jewish convert to Christian mysticism, who could not quite become a Catholic because the social manifestations of the Catholic Church were felt by her to be in conflict with the inner disciplines of the spiritual life. "It is almost impossible," wrote Simone Weil, "to distinguish faith from its social imitation. The soul cannot contain one part true faith and one part imitation of faith. It is almost but not quite impossible. Under present circumstances it is perhaps a question of life and death for faith that the social imitation should be repudiated."

We hope that Catholics will deal more kindly with Mr. Sugrue's strictures upon Catholic, as well as Protestant, "social imitations" of true faith, than was evident in their reaction to his recent criticism of Catholic desire for the prestige of a Vatican embassy. We hope that they will be properly appreciative of the spiritual discernment of a layman, who understands how easily the grace of the inner life can be corrupted by being made an instrument of a vast institution, competing with other institutions for power and prestige. We hope that Protestants will not cheer his strictures against his own church as without understanding that they involve discernments which convict us of the same corruption.

The secular world has its own faults and illusions. But it has a proper and healthy abhorrence of the prestige of sanctity being used as a weapon in the social struggles of men. Unless both Protestant and Catholics achieve a more sensitive awareness of the peril in which a religious community lives in its competitions with other communities, a secular democratic idealism is closer to the Gospel than either form of Christianity. For at its best that

^{*}Harper and Brothers. 64 pp. \$1.00.

(Continued on page 56)

The Political Attitude of German Protestantism

HEINZ-HORST SCHREY

AFTER the 1951 elections in Württemberg-Baden and Hessen, two largely Protestant areas, which had voted against the Christian Democrats, formerly the favored party, and for the Social Democrats, the Swiss newspaper *Die Tat* commented upon the outcome of this election under the headline "*Wittenberg und das heimliche Deutschland*" (Wittenberg and the secret Germany). The article said that these elections were typical for the fact that large portions of German Protestantism were against the Adenauer policy of German integration in Western Europe. The writer goes on, telling his readers that German Protestantism is facing a terrific political problem: to be the only bond which ties the two halves of Germany until they have grown together again. The struggle for Germany's reunification is a struggle for Protestantism's own existence in Germany. Wittenberg, Luther's town, is the symbol for this. It is the sole symbol under which Germany can reenter again into her historic role in Western civilization. Wittenberg, not Bonn, is the capital of secret Germany that is and will be a reality beyond all barriers of zones and times.

Why is it that German Protestantism in its representative leaders like Martin Niemöller and Dr. Heinemann, president of the synod of the Evangelical Church in Germany, is strongly opposed to the Adenauer policy which is trying to tie Western Germany closely to the West? This is because the Catholic background of this policy is showing more and more. Among the Christian Democratic Union the concept what Europe should be like is a typical Catholic one: a block of mainly Catholic countries including France, Italy, the Benelux-States, Spain and Western Germany which is predominantly Catholic. Great Britain and Scandinavia are not among these powers. Catholicism is the principle of order within this block which is strengthening itself against Communism with all means available. This idea of future Europe practically excludes Germany behind the Iron Curtain which is mainly Protestant. Thus the proposal for reunification, made by the government of the German Democratic Republic (DDR), was met in the West only with half-hearted interest and a good deal of diffidence what new trick the Russians would play this time. Even though this proposal interfered with the plans of the Chancellor, reluctant Adenauer could not help but take up the issue. So the case was submitted to the

United Nations, though direct discussions between the two German governments would have had better results. This can be considered an indirect result of the Berlin Kirchentag in August, 1951 which had the motto "We are still brothers!" This event has had an enormous echo, particularly in Protestant circles in Germany, in East and West and had to be reckoned with as a political reality.

There has developed a real dissension between the Adenauer coalition and Protestant leaders over this issue and the precedence of problems. Adenauer and the Bonn coalition believe that Western Germany should first be integrated in Western Europe before the problem of German reunification could be tackled. This firmness of the Chancellor seems to have made quite an impression on the Russians: they are ready to pay even a high price, if they can prevent Germany from rearming on the side of the West. This price is the withdrawal of Russian occupation forces from Eastern Germany and thus enabling Germany to reunite. From the Russian point of view this could only be achieved when Germany as a whole would not rearm. This proves that the reunification of Germany would never come about, if Western Germany were an integral part of the Western alliance. There is a definite alternative: either Germany is integrated in Western Europe and has to abandon eighteen millions of Protestant Germans behind the Iron Curtain, or reunification has precedence and Germany had to be neutral between East and West.

German Protestantism has made its choice. There is no doubt about the fact that the Russians would never render German territory to a government which has rearmed. They would never allow the leaders of this army to draft the young men of the Russian occupied zone into an army that would provide Eisenhower with the badly needed infantry which he eventually could use in a land war against Russia. This military weakness may have a wholesome retarding effect on United States politics: to prevent it from changing their strategy of defense into a policy of aggression or preventive war against Russia. So German nonparticipation in Western alliances would be a valuable contribution to the preservation of peace. German contingents in a future European or NATO army might be conducive to a dangerous policy of pride and challenge.

Americans are likely to ask two questions: first,

whether Germany was not willing to share in the common efforts of the free world to defend freedom and democracy; second, whether German Protestants are not too narrow in their outlook and think only in terms of their nation, while forgetting the wider perspective of the free world. Even the Ecumenical commission on international questions has asked this question, whether the Germans regard the unity of their nation as a divine order of creation. Some even refer to the division of Israel into two separate bodies politic after David. I may answer this way: Germans are certainly willing to share in the burden of Western defense. Yet, they cannot possibly exclude those behind the Iron Curtain from their political decisions, as long as there is a chance of having them back in a reunited Germany. We are called to love our brothers, even in politics. This means for us Germans that we have to include those Germans who are still suffering behind the Iron Curtain not only in our prayers, but also in our political plans. This has nothing to do with old style nationalism which is, despite some hysterical rightists, about to die out in Germany more than in other countries of the continent. We may be allowed to return the question, if the demand for the unselfish devotion for the cause of Western freedom is not a form of subtle hypocrisy on the part of those powers who would like to use German manpower and industry for their own purposes. There is no nation on this earth, nor a league of nations, that is entirely unselfish, only devoted to the service of ideals. And there is no nation that could be asked to be entirely forgetful of her very being, entirely unselfish and self-denying in her sacrifice to the ideal cause.

To ask Germans to forget about their brothers in the DDR would mean to overestimate their moral possibilities. The free world should gain the insight that a policy aiming at the reunification of Germany is not detrimental to the cause of freedom, on the contrary, it means an extension of the sphere of freedom to those who have been unfree for a long time. Things would take a terrible turn if Germans were going to rearm again. There are several aspects to the matter. Those military men in charge of the army would undermine the process of democratization in Germany; renazification would be the result of it. Cynicism toward the re-education of Germany, started by the Western Allies, a reactionary revolution of political values would be the inevitable consequences, if Germans were asked to adore the Gods whom they had to burn before. Military men are a poor safeguard for democracy, and the paradox phenomenon would develop: the policy undertaken to defend democracy would endanger it from within. This nationalist and reaction-

ary trend would also be promoted by another fact. Even if German units were integrated in a European army in which the Germans were on an equal footing with the rest, they had no influence on the strategical planning of the NATO and their possible employment, as Germany is no member of the Atlantic treaty. German military without full sovereignty would make a foreign legion out of German soldiers. A strong chauvinist reaction would be the consequence within Germany. Communist opposition against rearmament would be greatly strengthened by rightist elements. On the other hand, a national army in Germany, autonomous and self-determining, would be intolerable for France and England. These two nations are not sure whether they have to fear the Russians more or the Germans. Those who have known German occupation in the last war have good reasons to feel uneasy about the prospect of a new German army.

I think it is a task of first rank ecumenical importance that Protestants in America should try to see things from this angle. It is neither national resentment that governs Niemöller and Heinemann, nor denominational egotism, but sober political thinking that is guided by two ideas: love to the brothers behind the Iron Curtain and concern for the best possible contribution for world peace. True ecumenism should allow not only for a plurality of religious opinions, but also for a diversity of political decisions. German Protestantism has neither turned defeatist nor pacifist, but sees no other way of serving, not only its own cause, but also the cause of peace all over the world.

Protestantism in Spain

The *Indiana Catholic and Record*, which is the official organ of Archbishop Paul Schulte of Indianapolis, has this to say about the Spanish Cardinal Segura's strictures against Protestantism:

"... Protestantism is the wrong dragon today. Any lances that can be spared from the anti-Communist battle had better be tossed at other targets than Protestantism. A second lesson from current history might be derived from a comparison of the vitality and vigor of American Catholicism flourishing in a Protestant stronghold, with the protected and over-advertised brand of Catholicism in Spain.

"To some these remarks may smack of religious jingoism, but we feel it is past time for American Catholics to be relieved from the oppressive burden of our Spanish brethren. We have spent weary hours cleaning up the blood the Spaniards overzealously spilled in the Inquisition. If they wish to call the cops on the Protestants four centuries late they can take the blame themselves. Let them fend for themselves against the slings and arrows of world opinion. . . ."

Significance of John Cotton's Religious Thought for Today

COLBERT S. CARTWRIGHT

THIS year marks the tercentenary of the death of the New England Puritan John Cotton. Historians have minutely discussed the pros and cons of this man's dealings with Anne Hutchinson and Roger Williams, but virtually have left untouched his more lasting contribution to the American heritage of religious thought.

When Cotton came as a religious refugee from England to the shores of the New World in 1633 at the age of forty-seven, he was publicly chosen to be the teacher of the church at Boston. He was the colleague of the church's pastor, John Wilson. Both men were ordained ministers with all the privileges and obligations which ordination gave. Yet their duties were separate. The Cambridge Platform later expressed the distinction in this manner: "The pastor's special work is, to attend to exhortation, and therein to administer a word of wisdom; the teacher is to attend to doctrine, and therein to administer a word of knowledge." Thus, Cotton's primary work was centered in the creative teaching of theology.

It was in the field of theological thought that Cotton was pre-eminent in his own day, and it is in this area that he made his positive contribution to America's religious heritage. Cotton's lasting significance lies in his completely personalistic interpretation of the Christian faith. Consistently he thinks in terms of a personal divine-human encounter which only can be interpreted in terms of I and thou. Here in the beginning of American religious thought one finds an existentialist tendency which has today become of dominant importance in theological circles. A variety of doctrines interpreted by Cotton to his congregation illustrates this supreme concern with seeing Christianity as the personal encounter of man and God.

Sin for Cotton could not be an impersonal "missing of the mark." Christian living is not target practice, but obedient response to the will of God. In terms of personal encounter sin must be thought of as the breaking of a personal relationship between the Lord and his subject. The sinner "throws off the Crown from God's head." Sin is rebellion brought about through pride. Pride is "an inordinate affection of our hearts unto Carnal excellency, i.e. to be great in our selves, and for our selves; a proud man contends with God about the cause and end of his life, he will depend on himself, and makes himself the end."

For Cotton the horror of sin is not that it leads to hell, as some later Puritans emphasized. Sin brings a perversion to life. Without God one's life is so many zeros. But of even greater importance is the fact that sin is a tremendous disrespect and ungratefulness to God. Sin stinks in God's nostrils, and it would be well if it actually had a physical odor to it. Whimsically he says, "Were our mindes as quick to smell as our bodies, we should as much loath the smell or presence of sin, as of filthy dung: it is for want of spiritual sense, that we are no more affected with it."

While man dwells hopelessly in this spiritually deadened state of existence Christ may come to him through the medium of preaching, breaking open the door of the heart, seeking to deliver the prisoner. Cotton describes the prevenient work of Christ in this manner: "Hee doth many times breake open the doore of the heart, though wee bee unready and unlistly to open, hee lets fall in some savour of the Lord Jesus, and some relish of the Spirit of Adoption, Cant. 5.4,5. that though the heart bee drowsie and dead in sinne, yet it begins to arise and open to Christ; and then though Christ bee gone, yet the heart runnes after him, and though shee cannot of a long time finde him, yet shee continues to seeke him; and this is when the Spirit of Adoption hath made it a broken heart." It should be noted that this "preventing love of God to us" while crediting Christ with the initiative, leaves ample room for free responsible acceptance upon the part of each person encountered. In this role Christ is not so much the "hound of heaven" as he is the enticing lover. Carefully preserving the quality of personal encounter, Cotton at the same time interprets Christ's work in a dominantly positive manner.

A true Christian comes to accept Christ as his Lord for no other reason than the fact that He is the Lord. Christ is absolute. The Puritan teacher warns his congregation: "Stand not so much upon this, what Christ will be for you, but be sure that you be for him; let friends and all goe, and be sure you be only for him: . . . we must be content to come to him, and take him as he is, and stand upon no conditions with him. . . ."

Cotton's view of the Christian life as one of personal relationship to God permits a very real place in the kingdom of God for children. Children may be too young to learn the catechism, but they are

never too young to respond to a person. In words directly foreshadowing Horace Bushnell's principles of Christian nurture, Cotton admonishes: "If God have his number amongst Babes, then you that are Parents say not, it is too soon to learn them anything, they are too young, they cannot understand, why cannot you learn them to know you, and express joy in you, but teach them to know what an happy thing it is to have God for their father; tell them, that he is able to doe more for them, and give them better things than you can do. Levit. 23.10 to 15. take no comfort in them, till they take comfort in God; train them up to know God, to know his ways, that they may be able to rejoyce, and solace themselves in God and good things, that the first fruits of their age may be consecrated to God; and if you do so, you consecrate the whole lump, if the first fruits be holy, so will the whole Vintage be, if the root be holy so will the branches. . . ."

Remaining consistent with his interpretation of the Christian faith in terms of personal relationship, Cotton sees the Christian life as a responsive gratitude to God in Christ. The amazing coming of God in Christ, asserts Cotton, "must teach all such as are under the Covenant of Grace, to walk thankfully and humbly, and faithfully. . . . We must walk fruitfully with God in the sense of this Covenant, in pardon of sins, in beating down corruptions. . . ." Cotton is careful to warn against responding to the work of Christ rather than to Christ himself. "This is the sincerity of a Christian soule," states Cotton, "he desires more any benefit for Christs sake, then Christ for any of his benefits sake; for he whose heart is set upon Christ, more then upon the pardon of sinne, or salvation, that soule hath Christ, and life in him; he that hath Christ in his eye and heart above all blessings, he indeed is a true Christian, and hath Christ."

Having Christ is the all important factor in the Christian life. No amount of subjection to moral teaching or catechetical instruction can instill in one the good life. The Christian life is not one of adherence to moral law, but absolute loyalty to Christ himself. "A Christian knows," asserts Cotton, "that except his heart be warmed with the love of God, he cannot love his brethren." When man is confronted by Christ he no longer wonders what the precepts of love are. He finds his appropriate behavior in communion with Christ. "The rule of our love one to another," states Cotton, "is not now as we love our selves, but as Christ hath loved us."

One who has come to know and accept Christ as his sovereign is still plagued with sin in his life. In this earthly life one continues in corruption. Nevertheless, there is a change in the Christian, and real-

istically Cotton indicates the change. Although our Christian life be corrupt, this corruption "cannot carry a Christian man to doe all that wickednesse, which else he would breake forth into." There is always "something in the bottom that keeps possession for God, and makes him goe about it bunglingly, it becomes him not, he cannot set it forth with a grace." "The Law of the Spirit of life hath freed him from the skill of sinne, and from the command of sinne."

Nor does Cotton expect a utopian heaven on earth among the visible saints. "He that shall live in the best times of the best commonwealths, may see seats of judgments and justice corrupted with wickedness and iniquity," Cotton tells his church. But even if it were possible to collect into one place only those who are good, there would still be corruption. "If it was possible to assemble a company who are all good," asserts Cotton, "yet would they corrupt one another; yea, put what persons together you can, they will hurt and defile one another, in stead of doing good, Heb. 12.23."

The whole of Cotton's religious thought centers around a personal relationship between man and God as revealed in Christ. Holding firmly to this central reality, Cotton carefully develops his thought. He was aware that faith is ever prone to substitute some impersonal object in the place of Christ. This object of devotion may be one's own ego or some emotional feeling of religious experience. It might be a particular doctrine or body of teaching. Cotton cast aside all such idols, cleaving only to the saving personal fellowship with Christ.

Many modern American theologians, rebellious against much of American religious thought which often has either bogged down in futile scholasticism or sentimental optimism, have turned back to Reformation leaders for guidance in recovering a vital faith. Although at this particular time such action may be called for, we should at the same time not overlook the positive contributions of our own American heritage. Particularly in John Cotton, America's first religious thinker, do we see the same vital realistic faith of the Reformers, free from scholasticism and firmly established on American soil. Possibly now after three hundred years we shall find our generation in the proper mood to examine with sympathy and appreciation the rich heritage which is ours in the theological thought of John Cotton.

Authors In This Issue

Dr. Heinz-Horst Schrey is a lecturer of systematic theology at Tübingen University, Germany, and formerly an exchange student in America.

The Rev. Colbert S. Cartwright is the minister of the First Christian Church, Lynchburg, Virginia.

The World Church: News and Notes

Charges Dutch Reformed Clergy Rule South Africa

Capetown, South Africa (RNS) — This country's Dutch Reformed Churches have been welded into a "political machine" to carry out racist, reactionary programs of the once-banned Afrikaner Broederbond, an independent Dutch Reformed leader charged here.

Dr. D. J. Devos, a Dutch Reformed minister, told an overflow crowd in City Hall that 1,000 Predikants (clergymen) of the older churches had formed more than 1,000 "cells" in their respective parishes.

These cells, he said, are dedicated to securing control by "influential Broederbonders" of church councils, synods, presbyteries and school boards as well as city councils and trade and industry groups.

Through them, Dr. Devos declared, the predikants carry out orders of the Broederbond's "twelve apostles" and "rule South Africa from behind the scenes, changing governments and cabinets at will." He said the Broederbond and its adherents were sworn to achieving a republic that would suppress all resistance and destroy the freedom of all races other than whites.

The Broederbond (Union of Brothers), formed in 1919, went underground in the early 30s after it had been denounced by the coalition government of Field Marshal Jan C. Smuts and Gen. J. B. M. Hertzog. Marshal Smuts, then Prime Minister, called it Fascist and forbade civil servants to be members.

This ban was rescinded by Prime Minister Daniel F. Malan in 1948 when his Nationalist Party won the election and swept him into power. Dr. Malan and 60 of the 80 Nationalist members of Parliament are members of the Broederbond.

New laws put through by the Malan government and virtually disenfranchising the country's overwhelming non-European majority were recently declared unconstitutional by the Appeals Court. Dr. Malan has refused to accept the verdict.

Eighteen other clergymen were on the platform with Dr. Devos as he urged the calling of a national congress to discuss the situation and demanded the disbandment of the Broederbond.

German Church Forces Win School Victory

Duesseldorf, Germany (RNS) — Church forces in North Rhine Westphalia won a victory when the legislature here passed a new law recognizing schools in which children receive religious instruction as part of the State educational system.

The law provides for the establishment of three types of schools. There will be Roman Catholic and Evangelical "confessional" schools, "general community" (interdenominational) schools, with separate religious instruction in the respective faiths, and "ideological" schools having no religious character.

Supervision of all the schools will be carried out by

the State, but the churches will be entitled to watch over the religious instruction in the confessional and general community schools.

Under the new law, which states that the aim of the education is "to promote reverence for God and respect for the dignity of man," parents will have the right to decide to which type of school they will send their children.

British Congregationalists Face Serious Financial Situation

London (RNS) — Drastic staff cuts will be recommended to the national assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales when it meets in May because of the denomination's serious financial situation.

Rising costs and decreased income have resulted in a deficit in the church's headquarters accounts of nearly twelve thousand pounds (\$33,000), as compared with a deficit of a little more than six thousand pounds (\$16,800) a year ago.

The Union's Council will suggest that four secretaries be dropped for economy reasons. They are the Rev. Bernard Clifford Plowright, secretary of the Life and Work Department; the Rev. Richard John Hall, senior secretary, Youth and Education Department; Miss Mabel Small, editorial secretary and press officer, and the Rev. Philip Ashton, assistant secretary of the Union. Mr. Ashton had already tendered his resignation because of ill health.

Graham Stirs Interest in British Church Circles

London (RNS) — Hundreds of British evangelical leaders and workers crowded the assembly hall of Church House, Westminster, to hear evangelist Billy Graham report on his revival campaigns in America. The conference was called by the World Evangelical Alliance.

Reports of the evangelist's work in America have created great interest in British church circles. This interest results from the fact that side by side with officially planned evangelistic programs within the denominations there have developed several unofficial evangelistic movements. The World Evangelical Alliance has been attempting to coordinate all this evangelistic and revival activity.

Dr. Graham said that the United States was faced with three perils which he believed also faced Britain. Foremost among the three, he said, is "the peril from within."

Explaining this statement, he said that the U. S. had been founded by men who "trusted and believed in God" but that, during the last 20 years, the country had "wandered from its moorings." He pictured the nation as one in which "there is more gangsterism, more immorality and more divorce than ever in its history."

The peril from without, he said, is Communism "with

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

M. SEARLE BATES	LISTON POPE
JOHN C. BENNETT	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	AMOS N. WILDER
GLOSTER MONK, <i>Secretary</i>	

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	JOHN A. MACKAY
CHARLES W. GILKEY	FRANCIS P. MILLER
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	EDWARD L. PARSONS
UMPHREY LEE	

its great army and its great missionary force" which threatens the U. S. with "something more terrible than Nazism or Fascism."

The third peril is that of the judgment of God, Dr. Graham said.

"No nation can commit these sins of which the American nation has been guilty and escape the judgment of God," he declared.

Detroit Public Library
Book Receiving
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-53

70 Churches Name Delegates To Lund Conference

Geneva (RNS)—Some two hundred and fifty delegates from churches of different traditions in many countries will attend the third World Conference on Faith and Order to be held at Lund, Sweden, August 15-29.

An announcement by the World Council of Churches, which will sponsor the conference, said the Lund sessions "are expected to prove a landmark in the churches' continued quest for unity."

Already, the announcement said, 70 churches have appointed official delegates to attend the conference.

Invitations to the conference have been sent to churches in 43 countries. Among those invited are the Orthodox Church and the Free Churches in Russia, but no acceptances have been received from them.

Editorial Notes (Continued)

idealism understands Christ's observations about the mote in the eye of the other and the beam in our own eye.

The problem of corruption in government is bound to be made a partisan issue in the campaign; but it is an issue which obviously transcends party politics. While we cannot afford to be complacent about it, it is worth remembering that the procurements of the last two wars were conducted more honestly, though on a vaster scale, than those of either the Civil or the Spanish-American. In Britain there was something of the same improvement from the standards of the Crimean War to those of the present.

One reason for modern corruption is undoubtedly the increase in the power of government bureaucracies. Frequently the bureaucrat, with a salary of only a fraction of the income of businessmen with whom he deals, becomes the arbiter of their destiny. This is not to say that temptation could be removed by raising bureaucratic salaries. This solution was suggested in ancient China hundreds of years ago. But it is not a final solution. The fact is that there are methods of diminishing temptations, but there is no social or political method of insuring honesty in human relations. Max Weber believed that one of the effects of the Reformation was that its emphasis upon every man's direct responsibility to God made standards of honesty possible without which the vast credit relations of modern commercial society would not have been possible. One must beware of commending religious faith for its utilitarian values. But it is probably true that no society has enough detectives to protect itself against abuse if its citizens do not have a religious sense that "to me it is a small thing to be judged of men—he that judges me is the Lord."—R.N.